

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,810	08/04/2003	Atsushi Suzuki	241113US0DIV	4609
22000	7590 11/29/200' AK, MCCLELLAND N	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE ST	TREET	UNDERDAHL, THANE E		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		1651	•
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/29/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/632,810	SUZUKI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Thane Underdahl	1651		

·	Thane Un	derdahl	1651	
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the	cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 01 October 2007 FAILS TO PLACE T	HIS APPLICATION	ON IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to this application, applicant must timely file one of the places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in com time periods: 	or on the same of following replies a Notice of App	day as filing a Notice o : (1) an amendment, a eal (with appeal fee) in	f Appeal. To avoid aba ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of no event, however, will the statutory period for reply e Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box	this Advisory Action than SIX	orı, or (2) the date set fortl MONTHS from the mailin	ng date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MI Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1. NOTICE OF APPEAL	e date on which the d of extension and of the shortened state the later than three of 704(b).	the corresponding amoun atutory period for reply ori nonths after the mailing d	t of the fee. The appropr ginally set in the final Offi ate of the final rejection,	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as even if timely filed,
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS 	extension there	of (37 CFR 41.37(e)), t	o avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final reject (a) They raise new issues that would require furth (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE (c) They are not deemed to place the application appeal; and/or	er consideration below); in better form for	and/or search (see NC appeal by materially re	OTE below); educing or simplifying	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without cancell NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.3		ing number of finally re	jected claims.	
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CF 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would non-allowable claim(s). 	R 1.121. See attaion(s): be allowable if s	ubmitted in a separate	, timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s) how the new or amended claims would be rejected in the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: None Claim(s) objected to None Claim(s) rejected to None	s): a)	be entered, or b) 🗌 w or appended.	ill be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) rejected: 11-13 and 20-34 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action because applicant failed to provide a showing of good was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	od and sufficient	reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence is	necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of entered because the affidavit or other evidence faile showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary. 	d to overcome <u>al</u> essary and was r	<u>l</u> rejections under appe ot earlier presented. S	eal and/or appellant fai See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ls to provide a 1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An expla				
11. The request for reconsideration has been consider		•	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer13. ☐ Other:.	nt(s). (PTO/SB/08	B) Paper No(s).	L. Blaine Lankford Primary Examiner	Art Unit 1651
			,	

• While the Examiner has considered the response to the rejection of claims 11-13 and 20-38. While the Applicant continues to argue that the combination of references used to reject the above claims is improper in view of the teachings of Hsu et al. The Applicant presents an argument that Hsu et al. teach that Crataegus is useful for the treatment of hypertension and not chlorogenic acid and caffeic acid. However, Hsu et al. does teach that caffeic and chlorogenic acid are active ingredients of Crataegus which would imply to one of ordinary skill in the art that the active ingredients are responsible for the hypertension treatment by Crataegus. Therefore in view of Supreme court decision of KSR v. Teleflex, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to try the known active ingredients of Crataegus for hyper tension therapy.

Furthermore while the Applicant argues that the effects of synergism of caffeic acid and ferulic acid are apparent in view of the result of of Table 1. Especially comparing, at the 1 hour point, Test Plots 1-3 to Test Plots 4 and 5. However the Examiner fails to see the statistical difference especially in view of the standard deviation. Therefore the Examiner feels that his initial evaluation of this argument presented in the Property of the Standard Control of the Standard Contro

in the Final Office action (mailed 6/1/07) remains valid in the absence of arguments to the contrary